

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY****REMARKS**

This response is filed to place the above-referenced case in condition for immediate allowance.

Applicant has canceled Claim 1. Examiner advised that Claim 2 "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim." Pursuant to Examiner's advisement, Claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of canceled Claim 1.

Claims 3, 4 and 5, which were all dependent on canceled Claim 1, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103. Claims 3, 4 and 5 have been amended to be dependent on amended Claim 2. Because Claim 2 is made allowable by virtue of having been rewritten in independent form, by definition Claims 3, 4 and 5 must also be allowed.

Claim 6, which was formerly dependent on canceled Claim 1, was rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 because "the color, number, or symbol of each said pocket" lacked proper antecedent basis. Pursuant to Examiner's advisement, Claim 6 has been amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, by the fact that it is now made dependent on amended Claim 2, which provides the proper antecedent basis. Claim 6 has been further amended in regards to 35 U.S.C. 112 by the substitution of "rollable playing pieces" in place of "marbles."

Claim 7 must also be allowed as it has been amended to be dependent from Claim 2. In addition, Claim 7 has been amended by the substitution of "rollable playing piece" in place of "marble" to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claims 8-10 have been amended by the substitution of "rollable playing piece(s)" in place of "marble(s)" to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112.